

| SBC# | FCC# | Measure Name | Benchmark | Parity | Technically Infeasible |
|-------|-------|---|---------------------|--------|------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | Average Response Time for OSS Pre-Order Interfaces | √ | | |
| 2 | | Percent Responses Received within "x" seconds-OSS Interfaces | √ | | |
| 3 | | EASE Average Response Time | | | √ |
| 4 | 19 | OSS Interface Availability | √ | | |
| 5 | 1 | Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned within "X" Hours | NO AGREEMENT | | |
| 6 | | Average Time to Return FOC | NO AGREEMENT | | |
| 7 | | Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in SORD | √ ³ | | |
| 7.1 | 4d | Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Day of Work Completion | √ ³ | | |
| 8 | | Average Time to Return Mechanized Completions | √ ³ | | |
| 9 | | Percent Rejects | √ | | |
| 10 | | Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in LASR | √ | | |
| 10.1 | | Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 hour of receipt of LSR from CLEC | √ | | |
| 10.2 | | Percent Mechanized Rejects Received Electronically and Returned within 5 hours | √ | | |
| 10.3 | | Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours | √ | | |
| 11 | | Mean Time To Return Mechanized Rejects | √ | | |
| 11.1 | | Mean Time To Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via LEX or EDI | √ | | |
| 11.2 | | Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process | √ | | |
| 15 | | Percent of Accurate and Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills | √ | | |
| 16 | | Percent of Usage Records Transmitted Correctly | √ | | |
| 18 | 18 | Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) | | √ | |
| 19 | | Daily Usage Feed Timeliness | √ | | |
| 20 | | Unbillable Usage | √ | | |
| SBC # | FCC # | Measure Name | Benchmark | Parity | Technically Infeasible |
| 34 | | Count of Orders Canceled After the Due Date Which Were Caused by SWBT | | √ | |
| 51 | | Count of Orders Canceled After the Due Date Which Were Caused by SWBT - SPECIALS – Provisioning | | √ | |
| 55 | | Average Installation Interval | | √ | |
| 56 | 6c | Percent Installations Completed within "X" Days - UNE | | √ | |
| 64 | | Count of Orders Canceled After the Due Date Which Were Caused by SWBT - UNE – Provisioning | | √ | |
| 70 | 15 | Percent Trunk Blockage | | √ | |
| 71 | 20 | Common Transport Trunk Blockage | √ | | |
| 72 | | Distribution of Common Transport Trunk Groups > 2% | √ | | |
| 75 | | Percent SWBT Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days | | √ | |
| 77 | 14 | Average Trunk Restoration Interval for Service Affecting Trunk Groups | √ | | |

| SBC # | FCC # | Measure Name | Benchmark | Parity | Technically Infeasible |
|-------|-------|---|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 78 | | Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval | | √ | |
| 79 | | Directory Assistance Grade of Service | √ | | |
| 80 | | Directory Assistance Average Speed of Answer | √ | | |
| 81 | | Operator Services Grade of Service | √ | | |
| 82 | | Operator Services Speed of Answer | √ | | |
| 83 | | Percent Calls Abandoned | √ | | |
| 84 | | Percent Calls Deflected | √ | | |
| 85 | | Average Work Time | √ | | |
| 86 | | Non-Call Busy Work Volumes | √ | | |
| 87 | | Percent Installations Completed within "X" Days Interim Number Portability | | | √ |
| 88 | | Average INP Installation Interval | | | √ |
| 89 | | Percentage INP Only I-Reports within 30 Days | | | √ |
| 90 | | Percentage Missed Due Dates (INP Only) | | | √ |
| 91 | | Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines | √ | | |
| 92 | | Percentage of Time the Old Service Provider Releases the Subscription Prior to the Expiration of the Second 9-Hour (T2) Timer | √ | | |
| 93 | | Percentage of Customer Account Restructured Prior to LNP Due Date | √ | | |
| 94 | 1 | Percent FOCs Received Within "X" Hours | NO AGREEMENT | | |
| 95 | | Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes | √ | | |
| 96 | 16 | Percentage Pre-Mature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers) | √ | | |
| 97 | | Percentage of Time SWBT Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date | √ | | |
| 100 | | Average Time of Out of Service for LNP Conversions | √ | | |
| 101 | | Percent Out of Service < 60 Minutes | √ | | |
| 105 | | Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days | | √ ¹ | |
| 106 | | Average Days Required to Process a Request | | √ ¹ | |
| 107 | 17 | Percentage Missed Collocation Due Dates | | √ ¹ | |
| 108 | | Average Delay Days for SWBT Missed Due Dates | | √ ¹ | |
| 109 | | Percent of Requests Processed Within the Tariffed Timelines | | √ ¹ | |
| 110 | | Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs | | √ ² | |
| 111 | | Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs | | √ ² | |
| 112 | | Percentage DA Database Accuracy for Manual Updates | √ | | |
| 113 | | Percentage of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the DSR Process Without Manual Intervention | | √ | |
| 114 | | Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers) | √ ¹ | | |
| 115 | | Percentage of SWBT Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers | √ ¹ | | |
| 116 | | Percent of Missed Mechanized INP Conversions | | | √ |
| 120 | | Percentage of Requests Processed Within 30 Business Days (BFR) | | √ ⁴ | |
| 121 | | Percentage of Quotes Provided for Authorized BFRs Within 45 Business Days | | √ ⁴ | |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| √ | Represents agreement of the parties. |
| √ ¹ | Represents an interim agreement to measure to parity with Ameritech Affiliates and review in June 2000 |
| √ ² | Represents an agreement to measure electronic disaggregations as parity and manual disaggregations as benchmarks |
| √ ³ | Represents an interim agreement of the parties with a change to performance standard to 99% with a review in June 2000 |
| √ ⁴ | Represents an agreement to measure to parity with Ameritech Affiliates and an acknowledgement by Ameritech that the intent of these BFR measurements do not reflect all situations for which BFR's are currently used, but rather the traditional use of the BFR process. |
| <i>NO AGREEMENT</i> | Does not represent agreement of the parties, this is Ameritech's proposal |